

Doing Referring in Murriny Patha Conversation

Joe Blythe

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Arts
University of Sydney

February 2009

Dedication

For Jacqui, *purrima ngay*, and Zoe, *wakal ngan'gungintha*

and for my teacher, the late Elizabeth Cumaiyi
ku kalngaynu, wurdanngiyetjitj

ABSTRACT

Successful communication hinges on keeping track of who and what we are talking about. For this reason, person reference sits at the heart of the social sciences. Referring to persons is an interactional process where information is transferred from current speakers to the recipients of their talk. This dissertation concerns itself with the work that is achieved through this transfer of information.

The interactional approach adopted is one that combines the “micro” of conversation analysis with the “macro” of genealogically grounded anthropological linguistics. Murriny Patha, a non-Pama-Nyungan language spoken in the north of Australia, is a highly complex polysynthetic language with kinship categories that are grammaticalized as verbal inflections. For referring to persons, as well as names, nicknames, kinterms, minimal descriptions and free pronouns, Murriny Patha speakers make extensive use of pronominal reference markers embedded within polysynthetic verbs. Murriny Patha does not have a formal “mother-in-law” register. There are however numerous taboos on naming kin in avoidance relationships, and on naming and their namesakes. Similarly, there are also taboos on naming the deceased and on naming their namesakes. As a result, for every speaker there is a multitude of people whose names should be avoided.

At any one time, speakers of the language have a range of referential options. Speakers’ decisions about which category of reference forms to choose (names, kinterms etc.) are governed by conversational preferences that shape “referential design”. Six preferences – a preference for associating the referent to the co-present conversationalists, a preference for avoiding personal names, a preference for using recognitionals, a preference for being succinct, and a pair of opposed preferences relating to referential specificity – guide speakers towards choosing a name on one occasion, a kinterm on the next occasion and verbal cross-reference on yet another occasion. Different classes of expressions better satisfy particular conversational preferences. There is a systematicity to the referential choices that speakers make. The interactional objectives of interlocutors are enacted through the regular placement of particular forms in particular sequential environments. These objectives are then revealed through the turn-by-turn unfolding of conversational interaction.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I wish to thank those Murriny Patha speakers in Wadeye and Kununurra who have assisted as consultants for the PhD research and as team members on the larger Murriny Patha Song Project, to which this dissertation also contributes. I deeply regret that some of these people will not see the fruits of their contributions as they are no longer with us. I especially wish to acknowledge Phyllis Bunduck, the late Elizabeth Cumaiyi, Lucy Tchernia and Gertrude Nemarklak. The steadfast dedication of these women to this research, to the Murriny Patha Song Project and to cultural maintenance in general is seemingly unbounded. They are national treasures. Heartfelt thanks also goes to the late Lawrence Kolumboort, the late Felix Bunduck, Mary Bunduck, Mary Magdellene Birrarri, Rita Thawurl, William Parmbuk, Carmelita Perdjert, Ernest Perdjert, Dolores Narbarup, May Melpi, Christine Cumaiyi, the late George Cumaiyi, Majella Chula, Marita Chula, Patricia Karui, Tobias Nganbe, Julian Dumoo, Josita Cumaiyi, Alicia Cumaiyi, Maxine Cumaiyi, Theodora Narndu, Jacinta Crocombe, Naomi Tchernia, Beatrice Tchernia and Geradine Jabinee.

Many thanks to the rest of the song language team: Allan Marett, Linda Barwick, Michael Walsh, Nicholas Reid and Lysbeth Ford. It has been a pleasure working with you all. Thanks also to Jane Simpson, who, along with Linda and Michael, make a phenomenal supervisory team.

Whilst on fieldwork in the Northern Territory and in Western Australia I have been recipient of assistance, advice and kind hospitality from Dan Herbison, Frances Kofod, Marie Klesch, Chel Roxborough, Dominic McCormack, Gregor and Aquaria Renwick, Glenn Wightman, Dominique Sweeney, Bill Ivory, Robyn Seiboth, Greame and Sue Ward, Damon and Yvette Bradley, Phil and Beth Taylor, and Fr Leo Wearden.

It's not possible to overstate the help that Mark Crocombe has been, not just to my work, but for just about everything positive that happens in Wadeye (of which there is a lot). Mark is a tireless, dedicated, largely self-taught documentor of endangered cultural knowledge, a superb bushman, and surely one of Wadeye's greatest assets. He is doubtless one of the world's most unique individuals. Thanks

Mark, it's been a lot of fun working with you and I hope to keep doing so for many years to come.

The research has been greatly enriched by three and a half months spent as a visiting scholar at the University Of California Santa Barbara. Whilst there, I greatly benefited from the tuition and guidance of Sandra Thompson, Matt Gordon, Gene Lerner, Geoff Raymond, John W. Du Bois and Mary Bucholtz. These academics have been instrumental in giving me the tools with which I analyse the data in my corpus. Thanks also to the grad-students and visiting scholars who made my time there so enjoyable and stimulating. In particular, I'd like to thank Andrea Berez, Ed Luna, Eleonora Sciubba, Bert Cornillie and Christy Bird.

In addition to those already mentioned, the following people have provided tuition, useful advice, constructive criticism of draft papers or portions of the dissertation, or discussed relevant theoretical issues. Many thanks to Rod Gardner, Ilana Mushin, Johanna Rendle-Short, Celia Kitzinger, Rachel Nordlinger, Mark Harvey, Nick Evans, Alberto Furlan, Ian Green, Claire Bower, David Nash, Nick Riemer, Nicoletta Romeo, Tom Honeyman, Fiona Blake, Hilario de Sousa, James McElvenny, Aidan Wilson, Jason Lee, Sophie Nicholls, Sarah Cutfield, Myf Turpin, Mim Corris, Peter Newton, Frank Davey and Marie Elaine van Egmond.

During my candidature I have received huge support from Rachel Blythe, Mary Anne Taylor, Peter and Georgie Blythe, and Peter and Gwyn Tosi. Special thanks also to Richard and Sylvia Blythe whose assistance helped me to buy the 4WD campervan that was to provide both my transport and accommodation whilst on fieldwork.

Documentary linguistics, perhaps more than any other field, builds on the work of those who come before. In this respect, I am indebted to the prior linguistic and ethnographic work of Michael Walsh, Chester and Lynette Street, Father William Flynn, W.E.H. Stanner, Johannes and Aslaug Falkenberg and Alberto Furlan. In different ways they have all contributed towards this research.

This research was funded by the ARC Discovery grant into Murriny Patha language and song (DP0450131 2004-8).

Finally, special thanks to Jacqui Tosi. Your patience and love has made both the task doable and the journey enjoyable.

Declaration

This is to certify that except where otherwise indicated
this dissertation is entirely my own work

Joe Blythe

2009

A Brief Note on the Use of Personal Names

This thesis contains personal names of actual people who have passed away. Readers are urged to exercise caution in pronouncing out loud the names of such persons when in the company of relatives or others who may feel discomfort upon hearing these names.

Most conversation analytic research tends to anonymize persons by substituting names or using initials. The key Murriny Patha speaking collaborators in this research were the same conversationalists taking part in the fragments discussed in this dissertation. These people wished to have their own names used in the transcripts. Initials have been used for relatives of these people partaking in the conversations who gave permission for the material to be used, but weren't expressly asked about whether their names should appear in print. Names of persons referred to within the transcripts have not been anonymized as this can have unfortunate consequences for analysis. None of these names are unique identifiers. If any such persons are recognizable, it is hoped that no embarrassment is caused. No offence has been intended.

A Brief Note on Fragments vs. Examples

The distinction between fragments and examples is mainly one of treatment. Fragments are primarily considered from an interactional perspective. Examples are primarily considered from a morphosyntactic perspective. Fragments usually consist of more than one turn at talk and all are extracted from naturally occurring talk. The examples are usually single utterances or single turns at talk. Many are also extracted from naturally occurring talk though some examples were elicited.

Table of Contents

DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DECLARATION	vi
A BRIEF NOTE ON THE USE OF PERSONAL NAMES	vii
A BREIF NOTE ON FRAGMENTS VS. EXAMPLES	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
ORTHOGRAPHY	xiii
ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSING CONVENTIONS	xiv
KEY TO THE SYMBOLS USED IN KINSHIP DIAGRAMS	xvi
KEY TO TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS	xvi
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 THE STORY BEGINS	10
3 SOCIOLINGUISTIC AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	26
3.1 THE PORT KEATS MISSION	26
3.2 THE LANGUAGES OF THE REGION	29
3.3 SOCIAL ORGANIZATION	32
3.3.1 <i>The rise and fall of the subsections.</i>	32
3.3.2 <i>The Murriny Patha kinship system</i>	34
3.3.3 <i>Contemporary social groupings</i>	38
3.4 CONCLUSION	41
4 THE CORPUS OF MURRINY PATHA TALK-IN-INTERACTION	42
4.1 DOCUMENTING MURRINY PATHA LANGUAGE AND SONG	42
4.2 THE CORPUS	43
4.3 RECORDING NATURAL CONVERSATION	43
4.4 THE NATURE OF THE CORPUS	49
4.4.1 <i>The “natural” conversations</i>	49
4.4.2 <i>The song sessions</i>	50
4.5 ANALYZING THE TRANSCRIPTS	51
4.5.1 <i>On micro- and macro-analysis</i>	55
4.6 CONCLUSION	55
5 STUDIES IN PERSON REFERENCE	57
5.1 SOME TERMINOLOGY	57
5.2 A SEMINAL STUDY OF PERSON REFERENCE IN NORTHERN AUSTRALIA	62
5.3 STUDIES OF PERSON REFERENCE IN CONVERSATION	64
5.3.1 <i>Minimization and Recognition</i>	65
5.3.2 <i>Form and position</i>	70
5.3.3 <i>Problems with Minimization</i>	74
5.3.4 <i>Further preferences</i>	83
5.3.4.1 <i>The preference for Association</i>	83
5.3.4.2 <i>Circumspection</i>	88
5.4 CONCLUSION	93
6 DENOTATION IN MURRINY PATHA MORPHOSYNTAX	96
6.1 A REFERENTIAL SKETCH OF MURRINY PATHA	96
6.1.1 <i>Person, gender, number and siblinghood</i>	98
6.1.2 <i>The noun phrase</i>	101
6.1.2.1 <i>Nominal classifiers</i>	103

6.1.2.1.1 Existential negation	106
6.1.2.2 Nominal morphology	108
6.1.2.2.1 Demonstratives	108
6.1.2.2.2 Interrogatives	111
6.1.2.2.3 Free personal pronouns	113
6.1.2.2.3.1 Personal pronouns as definite referential expressions	113
6.1.2.2.3.2 Personal pronouns as possessives	114
6.1.3 <i>The verb complex</i>	118
6.1.3.1 Classifier-subject pronominals	120
6.1.3.2 Direct objects	127
6.1.3.3 Indirect objects	128
6.1.3.4 Object pronominals and number marking	129
6.1.3.5 Ethical Datives	135
6.1.4 <i>Vouns and Nerbs</i>	136
6.1.5 <i>The humanity of Murriny Patha morphosyntax</i>	141
6.2 THE LOCUS OF REFERENCE	146
7 PATTERNS OF ANAPHORA	155
7.1 REFERENCE FORMS AND REFERENCE POSITIONS	156
7.1.1 <i>The basic categories of reference forms</i>	157
7.1.2 <i>Local positions, global positions and the question of specificity</i>	161
7.2 THE BASIC ANAPHORIC PATTERNS	166
7.2.1 <i>The unmarked local anaphoric pattern</i>	166
7.2.2 <i>The global anaphoric pattern</i>	176
7.3 THE PRAGMATICALLY MARKED ANAPHORIC PATTERNS.	180
7.3.1 <i>Locally initial reference forms in locally subsequent position</i>	180
7.3.2 <i>Subsequent reference forms in initial reference positions</i>	188
7.3.2.1 Locally subsequent reference forms in globally initial positions	188
7.3.2.2 Locally subsequent reference forms in positions that are both locally initial and globally subsequent	193
7.3.2.3 Globally subsequent reference forms in globally initial positions	198
7.4 CONCLUSION	201
8 CONVERSATIONAL PREFERENCES AND REFERENTIAL DESIGN	203
8.1 REFERENTIAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES	204
8.2 THE PREFERENCE FOR CIRCUMSPECTION	209
8.3 THE PREFERENCE FOR ASSOCIATION	219
8.3.1 <i>Multiple associations in a conversational narrative</i>	222
8.3.2 <i>Self-association and epistemic authority</i>	229
8.4 COMPLEMENTARY PREFERENCES: CIRCUMSPECTION AND ASSOCIATION	235
8.5 COMPLEMENTARY PREFERENCES: ASSOCIATION, SPECIFICATION AND TARGETED RECIPIENT DESIGN	240
8.6 CONCLUSION	248
9 PROSODIC REFERENCE AND REPORTED INTERACTION	250
9.1 REFERENCE, FOOTING AND WORLDS OF INTERACTION	251
9.2 INDEXICAL CUES FOR REPORTED SPEECH	253
9.2.1 <i>Quotative expressions</i>	253
9.2.2 <i>"Ill-fitting" vocative expressions</i>	253
9.2.3 <i>Global prosodic marking</i>	255
9.3 GLOBALLY MARKED PROSODIC REFERENCE	256
9.3.1 <i>The scope of prosodic formatting</i>	259
9.4 LOCALLY MARKED PROSODIC REFERENCE	267
9.5 CONCLUSION	286
10 REFERRING AS AN INTERACTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT	289
10.1 SOME MUNDANE OBSERVATIONS ABOUT REFERENCE	291
10.2 DISSECTING REFERRING	297
10.2.1 <i>The beginning of a story revisited</i>	298
10.3 THE SPEAKER'S REFERENT AND THE HEARER'S REFERENT	301
10.4 MULTIPLE STAGES IN THE REFERRING PROCESS	308
10.4.1 <i>The speaker's tasks</i>	308
10.4.2 <i>The hearer's tasks</i>	310

10.5 REFERRED-ENTITIES AND REFERRED-PARTICIPANTS	311
10.6 SUCCESS AND FAILURE IN REFERENCE	330
10.7 CONCLUSION	337
11 CONCLUSION: DOING REFERRING – IN MURRINY PATHA CONVERSATION AND BEYOND	340
REFERENCES	349
APPENDIX A – CONJOINT MARKING OF NUMBER, GENDER AND SIBLINGHOOD IN THE VERBAL TEMPLATE	361
APPENDIX B – AUDIO LINKS TO CONVERSATIONAL FRAGMENTS	362
APPENDIX C – INTERLINEAR GLOSSES OF CONVERSATIONAL FRAGMENTS	362
APPENDIX D – THE TRANSCRIPTS OF TALK-IN-INTERACTION	388
2004-09-12JB04 (LONGBUM DINNER)	388
2004-08-08JB03B (SORROW)	415
2004-08-08JB03B CONTINUED (SPINY CHITONS)	425
2005-07-05JB01 (ON THE FLAT)	434
2005-07-15JB04B (WURLTJIRRI)	439
2006-07-01JB02A (TOTEEMS)	446

List of Figures

Figure 3.1 Murriny Patha and the surrounding languages.....	30
Figure 3.2 Murriny Patha kin charts.....	35
Figure 3.3 Functionally different kinship categories that lack unique identifiers.....	37
Figure 4.1 A “formal” recording session (12/9/2004).....	46
Figure 4.2 A “natural” recording session (12/9/2004).....	47
Figure 5.1 A possible explanation for the default status of first names as recognitionals in English conversation (after Levinson (2007, 69), with terminological adjustments).....	83
Figure 6.1 The Murriny Patha Verb Template.....	118
Figure 6.2 The direct object pronominal and the dual non-sibling number marker jointly denote the direct object denotatum.....	148
Figure 6.3 A layered representation of example 6.69, showing the flow of relevant semantic information that the hearer needs to pick out the two referents.....	150
Figure 6.4 The “functional domain of reference” is the set of all “potential referents” that are expressible by grammatical functions.....	151
Figure 6.5 Even in English, the “functional domain of reference” represents the true set from which the hearer must select the referent that they believe the speaker has in mind....	153
Figure 7.1 Locally initial and locally subsequent reference forms.....	161
Figure 7.2 Global and local reference positions.....	162
Figure 7.3 Global and local reference forms.....	163
Figure 7.4 Global and local reference categories superimposed on a specificity scale.....	165
Figure 8.1 Persons referred to in Fragment 63.....	227
Figure 8.2 The association of the referent to an addressed recipient places the referent squarely within a specified network of social relations for which the addressee is also a member.....	244

Figure 8.3 Personal names used as recognitionals imply a “prior knowledge association” between a targeted recipient and the referent, where the referent is placed in some network to which the targeted recipient also belongs.....	245
Figure 8.4 Using a locally subsequent reference form for globally initial reference to a salient person places the referent within a network of people known to the recipients.	247
Figure 9.1. Fragment 75 reports interaction between Phyllis’s grandson, Antonio, and Elizabeth’s son, G. Antonio and G address each other with the kinterm <i>thamuny</i>	260
Figure 9.2 Waveform of line 616 of Fragment 75 showing the slower isochronous timing.	263
Figure 9.3 Waveform of lines 616 – 621 of Fragment 75 showing the faster isochronous timing.	263
Figure 9.4 Kinterms superimposed onto the genealogy of the referred-participants in Fragment 76.	270
Figure 9.5 The reported interaction in Fragment 76. The two men (G and B) are the reported speakers, the two boys are “reported others”.....	271
Figure 9.6 Acoustic analyses of the two address terms <i>Thuykem</i> (line 515) and <i>wulgumen</i> (line 517) in Fragment 76.....	272
Figure 9.7 The reported interaction in Fragment 77. The two reported addressees are the men who were previously the reported speakers in Fragment 76.....	275
Figure 9.8 Kinterms superimposed onto the genealogy of the referred-participants in Fragment 77.	276
Figure 9.9 Pitch-trace and intensity of the kinterms <i>dedi</i> (lines 528 and 530) and <i>kaka</i> (line 532), in Fragment 77.....	278
Figure 9.10 Spectrogram showing creak in <i>kaka</i> (line 532) of Fragment 77.	279
Figure 9.11 Acoustic analyses of <i>thamuny</i> in lines 608, 623 (“daughter’s son”) vs <i>thamuny</i> in 612 (“mother’s father”) and of Fragment 78.	284
Figure 10.1 The <i>hearer’s referents</i> and the <i>speaker’s referent</i> associated with line 37 of Fragment 79.	304
Figure 10.2 The <i>hearer’s referents</i> and the <i>speaker’s referent</i> associated with line 107 of Fragment 79.	307
Figure 10.3 The four conversationalists in Fragment 80, from left to right: Elizabeth, Phyllis, Dolores and Manman.	313
Figure 10.4 Line 26 of Fragment 80 elaborates on the referent of line 21, in that it specifies two participants in the “carhold”, Phyllis and K.....	315
Figure 10.5 Could Phyllis’s husband K be one of the two siblings expressed in line 30?	316
Figure 10.6 The two “siblings” in Fragment 80, K and G, both shared the same mother’s father’s father.	318
Figure 10.7 The hearer’s referent and the speaker’s referent associated with line 26 of Fragment 80.	320
Figure 10.8 Successful referencing in line 30 of Fragment 80.....	322
Figure 10.9 Relationships between people referred to in Fragment 83.	333
Figure 10.10 Referential failure in Fragment 83.	336

List of Tables

Table 1 Vowel phonemes.....	xiii
Table 2 Consonant phonemes.....	xiii
Table 3 Non-sibling Number Markers.....	99
Table 4 The Murriny Patha Nominal Classifiers.....	103
Table 5 Third person Past Imperfective paradigm for the class 19 verb “follow”, showing the skewing between the morphological number of the CSP and the semantic number of the subject argument.....	122
Table 6 Third person non-future paradigm for the class 19 verb “follow”, showing the skewing between the morphological number of the CSP and the semantic number of the subject argument.....	127
Table 7 Third person direct and indirect objects, showing the skewing between the morphological number of the object pronominals and the semantic number of the object arguments.....	131
Table 8 Filler hierarchy for the number marking slots 3 and 9.....	135
Table 9 Reference categories and preference satisfaction.....	207
Table 10 Acoustic analyses of the two address terms <i>Thuykem</i> (line 515) and <i>wulgumen</i> (line 517) in Fragment 76.....	272
Table 11 Acoustic analyses of the kinterms <i>dedi</i> (lines 528 abd 530) and <i>kaka</i> (line 532), in Fragment 77.....	278
Table 12 <i>thamuny</i> in lines 608, 623 (“daughter’s son”) vs <i>thamuny</i> in 612 (“mother’s father”) and of Fragment 78.....	283
Table 13 The interactional process of referring as decomposed into speaker’s and hearer’s tasks.....	308

Orthography

The orthography adopted in this dissertation is the one developed by the Murriny Patha Song Project. The project orthography distinguishes four vowel phonemes (Table 1) and twentyfour consonant phonemes (Table 13). It differs from the community orthography used in Wadeye (Street 1987), which recognizes only a single laminal series. Velar nasals, represented with the digraph /ng/, are distinguished from alveolar nasal/voiceless velar stop clusters by an apostrophe /n'g/.

VOWELS	+ front	– front
+ high	i	u
– high	e	a

Table 1 Vowel phonemes.

CONSONANTS	bilabial	dental	alveolar	retroflex	palatal	velar
voiceless stop	p	th	t	rt	tj	k
voiced stop	b	dh	d	rd	dj	g
nasal	m	nh	n	rn	ny	ng
lateral			l	rl		
flap/trill			rr			
glide	w		r		y	

Table 2 Consonant phonemes.

Abbreviations and Glossing Conventions

1, 2, 3	first person, second person, third person
1-38	(when following person, number and subject marking) verb class
adj	adjective
adv	adverb
anaph	anaphoric demonstrative
br	brother
co	cousin (cross-cousin – fa.zi.ch, mo.br.ch)
COM	comitative
conj	conjunction
COV	coverb
ED	ethical dative
ES	experiencer ‘subject’ pronominal
EX	exclusive (of the addressee)
EXIST	existential
ch	[someone’s] child/progeny
CSP	classifier subject pronominal
da	daughter
DAT	dative
DAUC	daucal (i.e., the morphological collapse of dual and paucal)
DEM	demonstrative
DIST	distal
DU	dual
DO	direct object
DTRNS	detransitivizer
DUB	dubitative
EMPH	emphatic
EXIST	existential mood
F	“feminine” (i.e., non-masculine)
fa	father
FOC	focus
hu	husband
FPP	first pair part of an adjacency pair
FUT	future
FUTIRR	future irrealis
IBP	incorporated body part
INC	inclusive (of the addressee)
INDEF	indefinite
INSTR	instrumental
INT	interrogative
INTENS	Intensifier
INTERJ	interjection
IO	indirect object
IRR	irrealis
LEX	lexical root
LOC	locative

M	masculine
mo	mother
NEG	negator
NFUT	non-future
NOMCL	nominal classifier
NROOT	nominal root
NS	non-“singular”
NSIB	non-sibling
NUM	number marker
OIR	other initiation of repair
PART	particle
PAUC	paucal
PL	“plural” (i.e., the morphological collapse of plural and paucal siblings)
PLNAME	place name
POS	possessive
PREP	preposition
PRNAME	personal name
PRO	pronoun
PROX	proximal
PST	past
PSTIMP	past imperfective
PSTIRR	past irrealis
REDUP	reduplication
RELPRO	relative pronoun
RS	repair solution
S	“singular” (i.e., the morphological collapse of singular and dual)
S	subject
SERCSP	serial classifier subject pronominal
SERNUM	serial number marker
so	son
SOURCE	source
SPP	second pair part of an adjacency pair
STAT	stative
SUF	suffix
SS	Stative ‘Subject’ pronominal
TAGQ	tag question particle
TAM	tense/aspect/mood
TEMP	temporal locative
TOP	topicalizer
TNS	tense
UnId	unidentified speaker
VOC	vocative
wi	wife
zi	sister

Key to the Symbols Used in Kinship Diagrams

△	male
○	female
└─┘	sibling relationship
┌─┐	spouse relationship
▲, ●	key persons referred to in the relevant conversation (in the genealogies), ego (in the kin charts),
▲, ●	conversationalists

Key to Transcription Symbols

Text	Creaky voice.
┌,└,┐,┑	Overlapping speech. A: =0h yeah, ┌yeah┐. B: └ tha┘thangay.
(0.9)	Silence (i.e., 0.9 seconds).
(.)	0.1 seconds of silence.
[0.4]	Duration of a particular activity (seconds).
-	An abrupt cut off, usually a glottal stop. A: pam- pam+nubat damatha da nigunumana warda:thu, (0.2) She re- Now she really reckons that the warda nga- wardeye pa+nguyuꜰ whol- that the country around Wadeye belongs to her.
=	Latching (no gap or overlap between different speakers). A: <u>L</u> izabet.= Elizabeth. B: =Heyꜰ
=	Disjoined transcription of the same speaker's utterance. A: Pangibatkana:┌::m┐ nigurnuyu:::,= She was beating me, B: ┌hhh┐ A: =kardu ngay pakpak ꜰmema°dh°aꜰngardiyu::ꜰ I couldn't handle her I was too young
=	Where the '=' sign occurs mid-line, this indicates the immediate continuation of the turn after a point of possible completion. A: °ꜰYa pereninta thangu thangkugu damninthangkaꜰrdu;=pereninta= "Dunno. What, what were the two boys looking at?" The two men =wurdamninta°dh°ayiꜰweparlꜰwarda:thu ꜰnaꜰ° spoke at the same time, didn't they.
xxx xx	Indiscernible speech.

- (text) Difficult to discern text. Bracketing indicates either a best guess at transcription or text alleged by consultants that I believe to be dubious.
- hh Audible aspiration.
- .hh Audible inhalation.
- °Text° Utterance is softer than surrounding talk.
 A: °Da wangu ngimbilyi.° (0.4) °xxx.°=
 Ngimbilyi way. xxx.
 Also marks expected yet indiscernible phonemes.
 A: th_a::°ng°gu:.
 What!?
- >Text< Utterance delivered faster than surrounding speech.
- <Text> Utterance delivered slower than surrounding speech.
- >Text Quick uptake of speech, a rush-though.
- Stress Stress is marked by underlining.
- :
- Colons (without underlining or adjacent underlining) indicate lengthening or drawl.
- ↓, ↑ Marked shift to higher or lower pitch.
- ↑Text↑ Entire utterance delivered at higher than normal pitch.
- ↓Text↓ Entire utterance delivered at lower than normal pitch.
- :~↓ A downward pitch-glide.
 A: nyindaathu ngunawur↓eng; (1.0) ngunawar↓lakdhangini::~~↓; (.)
 From there I crawled. I crawled on my stomach.
- ::↓ A drawn-out syllable that drops suddenly in pitch.
 A: ngungurrkurrktha pangu::↓:. (0.4) tji↓nang.
 I laid down there. On the promontory.
- :~↑ An upward pitch-glide.
 A: *Be::~~↑:hɿ* (0.6) Nukunuka kudhangunuka::~~↑::~↓;;
 Right. After hunting he....
 (1.9)
 B: Manda.
 (He came up) close.
- ::↑ A drawn-out syllable that rises suddenly in pitch.
 A: Ma:↑mɿ (0.6) ma↑rru.
 Mum, (what about) Marru?
- ? Fully rising terminal intonation.
- . Fully falling terminal intonation.
- ˆ Mid-high rising terminal intonation.
- ; Mid-low falling terminal intonation.
- , Slightly rising terminal intonation.
- _ Flat terminal intonation (neither rises nor falls).
- x: Rising-falling intonation.
 A: Y_a::;
 I don't know.
- xˆ Falling-rising intonation
 A: Manangga rum tha↑rde kardanga°dh°a panibebengime neki:me:ˆ;
 There isn't even room in the truck to spit.

- word A preceding middle dot serves as a hardener, staccato.
- text! Utterance delivered forcefully or with emphasis, not necessarily loudly.
- CAPS Utterance is louder than surrounding talk.
- SMALL CAPS Utterance is delivered forcefully, but not loudly.
- ÷Text÷ Utterance has an animated or excited voice quality.
 A: ÷tham̩hu:~ny.÷ (1.5) ÷Ku thang̩gu ka̩ma:;÷
 "Grandson" (1.5) "What can it be?".
- Point of interest relevant to discussion.
- Bold** ← Particular point of interest relevant to discussion.